

MASS. GC5.2: R28



312066 0282 3663 1

REMARKS OF SENATE PRESIDENT
WILLIAM M. BULGER
BEFORE THE FIRST FRIDAY CLUB OF CLEVELAND
CLEVELAND, OHIO
JUNE 2, 1994

AUG 02 1994
University of Massachusetts
Depository Copy

America has been called upon five times to define its place in history.

In the eighteenth century, we stood for independence. In the 19th century, we stood for Union. In the current century we stood for freedom against the Nazis and Communists.

Now we face a challenge, a climactic struggle that will decide whether all the dying, all the daring, all the suffering, all the sacrifices of our past have been in vain.

It is a war of values and ideas.

On one side are those who hold with traditional Judeo-Christian morality. On the other side are the secular humanists, moral anarchists who deny the existence of any objective standards of behavior.

Dividing the two is a profound philosophical question:

Does every action have a consequence and are acts good or evil depending upon those consequences?

Religious revelations and the teachings of the great philosophers answer affirmatively:

They inform us that acts that corrupt our souls, our minds, our bodies and our society are evil. And that acts productive of opposite consequences are moral.

942/295

Secular humanists reject any litmus test of morality based on consequences. They say that established moral and spiritual values are myths--inventions enabling the powerful to stifle individual fulfillment and keep the people in line.

Thus the secular humanists inform us that objective standards of conduct are illusory, family values anachronistic, and that everyone is free to establish his or her own moral code. They tell us there is no room for God in the inn of our democracy.

Those who hold with traditional values argue that without moral moorings individuals can pretend to retain their humanity only by mutual deceptions . . . and that they -- and their society -- are doomed. They insist that human fulfillment is the product of self denial, self discipline, a striving -- however imperfect -- to be moral . . . and a concern for others. That is not an easy sell.

The secular humanists urge us to relax, to "do our thing" -- to celebrate a life without regard to objective moral precepts, without any notion of duty, or burden of guilt. If it makes you feel good, it can't be bad -- and the eventual consequences are unknown and irrelevant. Thus they offer free bread and circuses to the crowd -- the yeasty bread of permissiveness, the sensual circus of promiscuity. Many are finding that offer alluring.

It is a clash of two cultures. There is no basis for significant compromise. One side or the other must and will prevail -- for this house divided cannot stand indefinitely.

And the outcome will certainly decide whether this nation, as historically conceived and dedicated, will endure.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/remarksofsenatep00bulg>

The tidal wave of affection and support for the message of His Holiness Pope John Paul at Denver last August was a great celebration of traditional values.

The drug drenched self-abuse and spiritual squalor of the orgy known as Woodstock -- that encapsulation of the moral decline of the 1960's -- was the Black Mass of secular humanism.

From Woodstock to Denver the cultural conflict has raged.

How goes that battle?

The short answer is that it is not going well. In the past 35 years, the doctrines of secular humanism have made great inroads in our schools, our media and in America's daily life.

During that period, our society has become less educated, less stable and infinitely more dangerous:

- * Public education, preoccupied with political correctness and remote social goals -- some of them highly dubious -- is an international scandal.
- * We have witnessed a precipitous drop in the S-A-T scores of that system's best students.
- * Public high schools have graduated young men and women unable to read their diplomas.
- * A national study finds approximately half of the adult population to be functionally illiterate.
- * Marriages have declined in America. Divorces have quadrupled. There are more broken homes than ever before in our recorded history.
- * Teen-aged suicides have tripled.

* We have six times as much violent crime.

It must be acknowledged that during this period state and federal laws have been passed to discourage bigotry. And our society now condemns -- as well it should -- expressions of racial or religious hatred even when they are legally permitted. Is not that a great advance?

No, it is not! Condemnation of bigotry is a cruel and hypocritical delusion, if it is selective -- and in our society it is.

Catholics remain fair game for bigots. Hatred of us and our church flourishes. It is flaunted. So long as that is socially permissible, we live in a bigoted society -- and all its pretensions to the contrary are fraudulent.

A Harris poll some years ago reported that one-fourth of college-educated men and women in the Northeast who style themselves as liberals had anti-Catholic attitudes. They said Catholics were disloyal citizens unable to think for themselves.

And that attitude has become more prevalent with the growth of secular humanism:

A very recent study by the National Conference -- formerly called the National Conference of Christians and Jews -- makes that clear. It reports that a significantly larger number -- with a higher percentage of liberal white males in the Northeast -- now say Catholics are unthinking products and pawns of their Church.

That is consistent with the conclusion of the noted French sociologist Raymond Aron that:

"Anti-Catholicism is the anti-Semitism of intellectuals."

And, indeed, the study revealed that there are more Americans with anti-Catholic views than with anti-Semitic sentiments.

But you don't really need an opinion poll to tell you these things. The media publish or broadcast the evidence daily.

When Clarence Thomas was nominated to be a justice of the Supreme Court, then-Governor Douglas Wilder of Virginia asked: "How much allegiance is there to the Pope?"

Nothing has changed since:

There was the statement, by a New York councilwoman that a mayoral candidate was "suspect" because he had attended parochial school.

There was the feminist leader who attacked a Catholic candidate in Minnesota saying: "his first loyalty is not to the Constitution, but to his Church."

In my state there was a vice president of the New England Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Veterans who described a Boston city councilman as "a . . . Catholic bigot." The adjective suggests that anyone who follows Catholic teachings is, per se, a bigot.

Such statements are published routinely -- and draw none of the indignant editorial thunder evoked when others are attacked because of their religion. Why is that so?

Consider the government workplace:

In New York, it is not unknown for state employees who are members of the orthodox Jewish faith to wear Yarmulkes at work. Surely it is a harmless practice and cannot be said to interfere with their duties or offend any reasonable person. But that was not the experience a few weeks ago of one, David Hubicki, a Catholic employee at the Department of Civil Service in Albany.

Hubicki was ordered by his supervisor to remove from his desk a 3x5 picture of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. He was told there was a department rule barring the display of religious symbols in the workplace. Inquiry revealed, of course, that the supervisor had lied: But why would she do so?

Consider our schools:

The undeniable fact that parochial schools have spectacularly out-performed public schools is treated as a fault rather than a virtue. Jack Grier, a leader of the teachers lobby in Pennsylvania, speaking in opposition to school choice, proclaimed: "If the Catholic Church were to cease to exist and disappear today, it would be better for all of us."

Consider what happens at a politically-correct university:

The career of Patrick Mooney, a Catholic student at Carnegie-Mellon University in Pennsylvania is a case study of the selective sensitivity of that institution.

Mooney earned money toward his tuition by working as a resident assistant. During one activity at the school, he was directed to wear a pro-lesbian lapel button -- and refused on religious grounds. He was fired. Had the school served pork chops

at the lesbian function, it is highly unlikely that Islamic students who refused to eat them on religious grounds would have been punished.

But Mooney's victimization was just beginning:

A few weeks ago, when a homosexual group put up a poster with John Cardinal O'Connor's picture over the inscription: "Know Your Scumbags," Mooney complained to a professor. He was ignored.

He removed the poster to show it to school authorities. Their reaction was to charge him with harassment for bothering the professor and to place him on probation for removing the poster.

This time the Catholic League protested vehemently and Mooney's punishment was to some degree reduced. But there was no disapproval of those who displayed the poster.

The apparent license for Catholic bashing, however crude and offensive, leads us to ask: Do we still have a free press, or has it largely become the captive and servant of the counter culture?

There is no suggestion here that the media are deliberate participants in a secret combination dedicated to promoting secular humanism at the expense of truth.

I submit they act as they do largely because the media reflect the views of writers and editors who are themselves secular humanists . . . or who are peculiarly vulnerable to the sophistry of that movement.

That conclusion is supported by research into attitudes of journalists and broadcasters at the most influential media outlets. It reveals that:

- 54% do NOT consider adultery wrong;
- 85% believe extra-marital affairs are morally acceptable;
- 90% are pro-abortion.

Is it any wonder the seeds of secular humanism flourish in such fallow ground?

It helps us understand, for example, why --

The Boston Globe, described a disorder at a Boston Cathedral as a "colorful, loud and peaceful" demonstration. It did not tell its readers of the obscene parody of the Communion rite in which condoms were substituted for the host . . . It did not tell that the Sermon on the Mount was mocked as an endorsement of sodomy -- It did not report the assaults on priests or the simulated sex acts. I submit that the deliberate omission of relevant and significant facts is, itself, a statement.

The mind-set of media employees explains why the invasion and desecration of St. Patrick's Cathedral were celebrated in a film called "Stop the Church" . . . and why it was aired by so many Public Broadcasting stations.

It explains why the New York Times defended the "critical opinion" of those who called St. Patrick's "that house of walking swastikas" and referred to Cardinal O'Connor as "a fat cannibal" and "a creep in black skirts."

It explains why a St. Louis TV station would hire a male prostitute with instructions to entrap Catholic priests. Nothing happened for the hidden cameras to record, but that does not abate

the viciousness of the plot.

Our Church -- like all major religious groups in the United States -- has experienced occasional sexual misconduct involving clergy, in our case less than one percent. But instances -- true and false -- involving Catholics have been so eagerly publicized that the Church has had to confront a number of fraudulent suits brought by plaintiffs hopeful of extorting a cash settlement.

We all recall the outrageous libels against Cardinal Bernardine of Chicago by an AIDS patient named Stephen Cook, a man with a long history of alcohol and drug abuse. Cook had been persuaded under hypnosis to allege a spurious memory of the event.

All the major networks gave Cook a platform comparable to the President's State of the Union message. Ted Turner's CNN pulled all the stops. Even the Minneapolis Star Tribune called its performance "Yellow journalism at its worst."

By the time Cook admitted his charges were untrue, the media had done its damage -- and Turner's wife, Jane Fonda, was off to the United Nations where she attacked the Pope.

But none of that prevented a California firm from producing for sale a collection of trading cards that included the misbehavior of Jim Bakker under the title: "Perverted Priests."

Why should anti-Catholicism shock any of us? Nativist bigotry against us and our Church is not new -- it pollutes our country's history. But there are two aspects to it that demand attention:

One is the rate at which it is growing.

The second is the fact that anti-Catholicism today is totally unlike that in prior years: It is no longer aimed at coercing Catholics to abandon their Church -- the purpose now is to force the Church to abandon Catholicism.

- The Church is told it must change its doctrine on abortion.
- It must relax its teachings on sexual behavior.
- It must redefine its concepts of sin.
- It must restructure its clergy.
- It must even make substantive changes in its prayers.

Above all, we are told, Pope John Paul must compromise the tenets of our faith. He must abandon them sufficiently to satisfy spurious demographics. He must change the dogma of Catholicism -- the way a laundry soap changes its wrapper.

The Boston Globe wants the Church to stop urging Christians to shun films that blaspheme Christ and the Mother of Jesus. The Times tells us to accept blasphemy as a First Amendment right that the Church must not seek to protest by economic boycott.

The Philadelphia Inquirer tells bishops who speak against abortion that they may reawaken old religious prejudice against Catholics by "giving it substance" . . . in other words by proving it well-founded!

Catholics are admonished to silence their opposition to sexual promiscuity -- even though more Americans are dying of ordinary venereal diseases than from AIDS.

We are told to stop being "up tight" about sex education for third graders, the latter being a particular pet project of the surgeon general, Jocelyn Elders, a practiced Catholic basher.

Dr. Elders has accused the Catholic Church of indifference to black slavery, the plight of American Indians and the slaughter of Jews in the Holocaust. Perhaps that attitude helps explain why the national administration has not appointed a single Catholic to a position of any real importance.

The silence that the secular humanists and their allies would impose on us is selective:

Clergymen of other faiths are not criticized for giving their views on issues. And even statements by our bishops are widely published when they are supportive of the views of the media -- such as opposition to the death penalty or in favor of a nuclear freeze. Catholic views of social or political issues are welcomed in such instances.

But let a bishop speak against secular humanism, against abortion, against socially-engineered education and he is warned to stop trying to impose his views on society.

The effort to change Catholicism to something else is buttressed by a media myth of Catholic rebellion. It has been fed by a small but noisy parade of make-believe Catholics. They all claim to believe in everything about the Church except its religion.

During the weeks preceding the Pope's arrival in Denver, we were told that American Catholics were rising against their Church.

The campaign was even given a name -- "Days of Dissent."

It was supported by CNN network which conducted a manipulated poll where questions were shaped to evoke desired responses.

It was supported by renegade priests and self-styled escaped nuns who were trotted out by the media to bear false witness to the alleged schism.

It was based on the testimony of so-called dissidents such as Frances Kissling, president of something called Catholics for a Free Choice, which is financed by the likes of Hugh Hefner, publisher of Playboy Magazine. She has since admitted -- under questioning -- that she is the only member of her organization.

But that was after she had been presented as the voice for a substantial flock of disenchanted Catholics.

In the week prior to the Pope's arrival a small and strange collection of publicity seekers arrived in Denver. They included no one who practiced Catholicism.

They called themselves Catholics, though they repudiated our dogma, assailed the Pope and mocked the Church's tenets of morality. Some said they worshipped trees and stones as well as Jesus Christ. One woman said she prayed to a pagan goddess. One man said the only things he liked about the Church were its music and stained glass windows. Others were equally bizarre.

But the media identified them as the vanguard of aroused Catholics who were headed in huge numbers to demonstrate against the Pope.

That army never appeared. And its alleged vanguard vanished in the morning mists when hundreds of thousands of genuine Catholics began arriving.

Who can forget that August day in Denver?

The massed ordnance of the media was mounted at the airport of that mile-high city. There were cameras of every caliber. There were recorders, tape machines and microphones.

And all that weaponry of communications was aimed at a single target -- Pope John Paul.

There was a legion of reporters, columnists, commentators and technicians from around the world gathered there, all of them watching that target expectantly.

They jockeyed for position, stepping gingerly through a surrealistic snakepit of tangled cables and wires. Most of them waited confidently for the signal they had predicted -- a gesture of surrender or at least of compromise.

It was raining that day, you'll remember. Our Pope stood there on the wet tarmac . . . seeming strangely alone despite the number of public figures who surrounded him. Many of them had espoused positions he condemned. Many of them had predicted the moral retreat the media anticipated. All of them sought the photo opportunity.

But from the moment he began to speak -- urging everyone to choose life, to aspire to the objective standards of morality -- it was evident that he and our Church were undaunted.

The media were stunned. Their predictions of moral capitulation had proved totally wrong. They rebuked him, at least implicitly, for not moderating his remarks to avoid embarrassing any of the assembled political figures.

But that was the dying whimper of the manufactured and nonsensical campaign entitled "Days of Dissent." A half-million ecstatic followers attended his Mass. An estimated three billion participated by watching it on television.

Our Pope's unequivocal and joyous reaffirmation of the teachings of the Catholic Church was inevitable. Through years of abuse when life itself was at risk, he had never wavered . . . he could hardly be cowed by journalists or renegades posing as Catholics.

For almost two thousand years many mighty forces -- with all their lies and laws, all their coercive powers and cruel instrumentalities -- have sought desperately to crush that faith. All have failed.

Our faith remains, powerful and strong as truth itself.

It should then be clear that it is not our faith that can be destroyed by the anti-Catholicism of secular humanists.

It is our nation, as it was conceived and dedicated by our forefathers, that is at risk.

That, I suggest, is what Pope John Paul is telling us.

Let us hope his message was heard by Americans of whatever faith.

The message that good is good, and evil is evil -- and never
the twain shall meet.

I thank you.

